

LAW OFFICES

Stetina Brunda Garred & BruckerA PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
PATENT, TRADEMARK, COPYRIGHT AND UNFAIR COMPETITION CAUSES75 ENTERPRISE, SUITE 250
ALISO VIEJO, CALIFORNIA 92656KIT M. STETINA
BRUCE B. BRUNDA
WILLIAM J. BRUCKER
MARK B. GARRED
MATTHEW A. NEWBOLES
ERIC L. TANEZAKI
LOWELL ANDERSONTELEPHONE (949) 855-1246
FACSIMILE I (949) 855-6371
FACSIMILE II (949) 716-8197
www.stetinalaw.comSEAN O'NEILL
JAMES C. YANG
SHUNSUKE S. SUMITANI
STEPHEN Z. VEGH
AMY L. CROCETTI ***FACSIMILE COVER SHEET**

November 27, 2006

BENJAMIN N. DIEDERICH †
MICHAEL J. ZINGALE †**TO: Michelle Eason****COMPANY: USPTO****FROM: Mark Garred****OUR REF: REXIN-000 YOUR REF:****FAX NO.: 571-273-0101****NO. OF PAGES INCLUDING THIS COVER SHEET 3****IF YOU DO NOT RECEIVE ALL OF THE PAGES OF THIS FAX OR IF THEY ARE
ILLEGIBLE, PLEASE CALL ANDREA LEVINE AT (949) 855-1246.****MESSAGE:**

THE DOCUMENTS ACCOMPANYING THIS FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION CONTAIN INFORMATION FROM THE LAW FIRM OF STETINA BRUNDA GARRED & BRUCKER WHICH IS CONFIDENTIAL AND/OR LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. THE INFORMATION IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY NAMED ON THIS TRANSMISSION SHEET. IF NOT IN THE HANDS OF THE INTENDED RECIPIENT(S), ANY DISCLOSURE, COPYING, DISTRIBUTION OR THE TAKING OF ANY ACTION IN RELIANCE ON THE CONTENTS OF THIS TELECOPIED INFORMATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS FACSIMILE IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US BY TELEPHONE IMMEDIATELY SO THAT WE CAN ARRANGE FOR THE RETURN OF THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS TO US AT NO COST TO YOU.

* ADMITTED TO PENNSYLVANIA BAR ONLY
† PATENT AGENT

LAW OFFICES

Stetina Brunda Garred & BruchA PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
PATENT, TRADEMARK, COPYRIGHT AND UNFAIR COMPETITION CAUSES75 ENTERPRISE, SUITE 250
ALISO VIEJO, CALIFORNIA 92656KIT M. STETINA
BRUCE B. BRUNDA
WILLIAM J. BRUCKER
MARK B. GARRED
MATTHEW A. NEWBOLES
ERIC L. TANEZAKI
LOWELL ANDERSONSEAN O'NEILL
JAMES C. YANG
NATHAN S. SMITH
SHUNSUKE S. SUMITANI
STEPHEN Z. VEGHJESSIE WANG *
BENJAMIN N. DIEDERICH *TELEPHONE (949) 856-1246
FACSIMILE I (949) 855-6371
FACSIMILE II (949) 716-8197
www.stetinalaw.com
Writer's Direct E-mail:
mgared@stetinalaw.com

March 2, 2006

Mr. William J. Rex
Rexhall Industries, Inc.
46147 7th Street, West
Lancaster, CA 93534RE: Case No.: REXIN-012A
Serial No.: 10/821,314; Filing Date: 04/09/2004
Recreational Vehicle with Side Out Members

Dear Bill:

We have received an Office Action rendered by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office in relation to your above-identified patent application. A copy of this latest Office Action including the cited references is enclosed for your review.

As you will note, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 10-13, 15, 16 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Crean reference in view of the Morrow reference. Additionally, the Examiner has rejected Claims 4, 7, 8, 14, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crean in view of Morrow as applied to Claims 1-12 above and further in view of the Futrell reference. Finally, Claims 9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crean in view of Morrow as applied to Claims 5 and 15 above and further in view of the McManus reference.

After considering the various rejections advanced by the Examiner in this latest Office Action, we contacted the Examiner and conducted a telephone interview to discuss in depth the substance of these rejections and potential claim amendments which could be advanced in a response to this Office Action for purposes of overcoming such rejections. After considering the various comments made by the Examiner during this telephone interview, we were able to formulate a potential response to the outstanding Office Action which would include arguments in support of the patentability of the pending claims of the present application as they currently stand, as well as some additional claims more narrowly defining the plumbing features of one of the modular slide outs.

Stetina Brunda Garred & Brucker

March 2, 2006

Page 2

Please be advised that a response to the outstanding Office Action must be prepared and filed on or before April 24, 2006 to avoid the payment of any late filing fees. Such response can be prepared and filed at any time prior to July 24, 2006 with the payment of a progressively higher late filing fee for each month of extension beyond the initial April 24, 2006 deadline. The failure to file a response to the Office Action on or before the extended July 24, 2006 deadline will result in the abandonment of the application.

I received in the mail the vendor summary that you forwarded to me regarding legal fees that Rexhall Industries has incurred with our firm over the last ten years. It appears from your breakdown, that the yearly average of money spent on legal fees with our firm is \$3,800.00. In my view, this is certainly not unreasonable, and entirely justified based on the scope of the work completed on your behalf in that time frame, the currently active matters related to such work being reflected in the attached matrix.

Since the impression I have taken from your correspondence is that you are dissatisfied with my representation, I have no objection to immediately effectuating my withdrawal as counsel and transferring each of your active case files to substitute counsel of your choosing. Please let me know if and to whom such transfer should be completed. With particular regard to the patent application to which this letter is directed, I will take absolutely no further action in relation thereto unless specifically instructed by you to do so. Thus, absent receiving your authorization to proceed with the preparation and filing of a suitable response to the outstanding Office Action in advance of the deadlines set forth above, I will not undertake to prepare and file any such response, and will allow this application to go abandoned in due course.

If you have any questions regarding these matters, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

STETINA BRUNDA GARRED & BRUCKER



Mark B. Garred

MBG/akl
Enclosure